

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's allowance of Claims 37-41, 43-52 and 69.

Applicants will now address each of the Examiner's remaining rejections in the order in which they appear in the Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

Claims 1-5, 8, 10-15, 53-57, 59, 61-67 and 70

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 1-5, 8, 10-15, 53-57, 59, 61-67 and 70 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamada (US 6,114,715) in view of Friend et al. (US 6,518,700) and further in view of Nagayama et al. (US 5,742,129). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Initially, Applicants note that independent Claims 1 and 53 recite the feature of "a partition wall *covering an edge of the first electrode*" (emphasis added). Applicants respectfully submit that none of the cited references disclose this claimed feature. For example, the Examiner cites Hamada and contends that it discloses a partition wall (2) covering an edge of the first electrode (53 +103). However, black-matrix layer (2) in Hamada does not cover the edge of source electrode 53 and anode 103 in Hamada. As this claimed feature is not shown in the other references, Claims 1 and 53 are patentable over the references.

However, while Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending independent Claims 1 and 53 to recite the feature of "including at least a reflective metal film, a light transmissive insulating film" after the feature of "the partition wall comprises a laminate of an organic resin layer and a light-absorbing layer" in the claims.

None of the cited references, alone or in combination, appear to disclose or suggest this claimed feature.

Therefore, independent Claims 1 and 53 are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, and Claims 1 and 53 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 9 and 60

The Examiner also rejects Claims 9 and 60 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamada in view of Friend in view of Nagayama in view of Oda et al. (US 6,396,208). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Each of these claims is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed herein for the independent claims, these claims are also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 8, 10-15, 53-54, 56-57, 59 and 61-66

The Examiner also rejects Claims 1-2, 4-5, 8, 10-15, 53-54, 56-57, 59 and 61-66 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamada in view of Friend and further in view of Iwase et al. (US 6,768,534) in view of Nagayama. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Independent Claims 1 and 53 are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references for at least the reasons discussed above. Accordingly, Claims 1 and 53 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over the cited references, and it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 9 and 60

The Examiner also rejects Claims 9 and 60 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamada in view of Friend in view of Iwase in view of Nagayama in view of Oda. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Each of these claims is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed herein for the independent claims, these claims are also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-5, 8 and 10-15

The Examiner also rejects Claims 1-5, 8 and 10-15 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamada in view of Friend in view of Kaneda et al. (JP 2000-269473) and further in view of Nagayama. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references for at least the reasons discussed above. Accordingly, Claim 1 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over the cited references, and it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 9

The Examiner also rejects Claim 9 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamada in view of Friend in view of Kaneda in view of Nagayama in view of Oda. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

This claim is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed herein for the independent claims, this claim is also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 23-27, 29, 31-36 and 68

The Examiner also rejects Claims 23-27, 29, 31-36 and 68 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamada in view of Friend in view of Kaneda in view of Nagayama. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Initially, Applicants note that independent Claim 23 recites the feature of “a partition wall *covering an edge of the first electrode*” (emphasis added). As explained above, none of the cited references disclose this claimed feature. Therefore, Claim 23 is patentable over the cited references.

However, while Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending independent Claim 23 to change the claim language of “three layers formed of different materials” to “at least a reflective metal film, a light transmissive insulating film, and a film partly absorbing light.”

None of the cited references, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest this claimed feature.

Therefore, independent Claim 23 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, and Claim 23 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 30

The Examiner also rejects Claim 30 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamada in view of Friend in view of Kaneda in view of Nagayama in view of Oda. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

This claim is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed herein for the independent claims, this claim is also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is

respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicants are submitting an information disclosure statement (IDS) herewith. It is respectfully requested that this IDS be entered and considered at this time and prior to the issuance of any further action for this application.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any fee is due for this amendment, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Date: January 6, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark J. Murphy/

Mark J. Murphy

Registration No. 34,225

COOK ALEX LTD.
200 West Adams Street
Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500

Customer No. 26568